Biometrika Trust Strategy Review: Executive Summary

Membership

Peter Green (Chair), Mark Yarrow (Coordinator), Peter Diggle, Daniel Farewell, Simon Harden, Martin Lamaison, and Sylvia Richardson.

Strategy Group Remit

The Biometrika Trust is facing two key issues:

1. A shift in the publishing industry (often funder mandated) towards open access (OA). In this shift, there are a number of different models available (such as R&P). However, regardless of model it appears as though income will come from authors (their institutions) paying to publish rather than libraries paying for subscriptions.
2. How to spend any excess assets and future profits.

The Trust's core publishing income is gradually declining (ignoring unpredictable secondary rights) and current projections indicate that publishing will do no better than break even over the next few years. OUP's forecast is that in order to maintain current levels of income in a Read & Publish (R&P) world, we will need to increase the number of articles we publish annually. This raises the question of what we can do to ensure that Biometrika is secure financially for the foreseeable future.

The move to OA changes the nature of competition between journals. Until now, libraries would typically subscribe to all the leading statistics journals, a fairly comfortable situation. However, in the near future, most income will depend upon authors deciding to pay to publish in Biometrika as opposed to one of our competitors.

Mode of working

The group met nine times between June 2023 and May 2024. Additionally, individual members held meetings with a range of interested parties (such as the Editor, Editorial Assistant, OUP, IMS/Mattson, and various University librarians).

The work was split into six modules related to the key issues indicated in the Remit. These modules are as follows:

M1. Author publishing habits
M2. Competitor analysis
M3. Publishing industry assessment
M4. Journal growth feasibility
M5. Publishing options
M6. Investing surplus back into the community.

This executive summary was formed based on a much larger working document. The working document can be viewed by any Trustee on request to the Chair.

Paper structure

This paper is broken down into the following sections::

1. General observations which refer to the six modules noted above.
2. A set of recommendations.
3. An appendix section containing:
   A1) An assessment of the impact of a possible move from OUP to IMS-Mattson.
   A2) Motivations for the recommendations.
   A3) Tables referred to in the general observation and recommendations sections.

General observations

1. The group decided that the three main comparator journals in the area of statistical theory and methods (and their publisher) are RSS Series B (OUP), JASA Theory & Methods (Taylor & Francis), and Annals of Statistics (IMS). In an OA environment, these may be viewed more as competitors than in the past. [Modules M1 - M5]

2. A survey of Biometrika authors, associate editors, and trustees was conducted. Biometrika was shown to be highly rated within the population, however behind AoS and RSSB. It should be noted that people are 'ranking' the four journals based on their own criteria which will differ person to person. A summary of the survey's open text comments can be found in Table 2 (appendix 3). The full (unprocessed) version is also available here.

3. The Author publication charge (APC) for Annals of Statistics is an outlier compared with Biometrika, JRSSB, and JASA T&M. A breakdown of current APCs can be seen in Table 3 along with impact factors (appendix 3). A journal size breakdown is found in Table 4 (appendix 3). [Module M5]

4. The publishing industry remains in a state of flux without a clear point of convergence which satisfies all of authors, libraries, publishers or readers. [Modules M3 and M5]

5. The importance of statistics in the University sector is growing. Recruitment in statistics is strong globally; there is high student interest in the area because of skills necessary for the workplace. It is becoming common for statisticians to be attached to research grants (as collaborators and/or consultants) in non-mathematical areas. All of this should lead to more researchers in the area, and subsequently more research articles with potential to be published in Biometrika. [Module M4]

6. Journal growth can be achieved in a number of ways. However, in order not to compromise on quality and to ensure Biometrika continues to be an exciting journal for our readership, the principal options are (i) to attract more of the same kind of articles to Biometrika instead of our competitors, or (ii) to broaden Biometrika's remit to include neighbouring areas of work. [Module M4]

7. The IMS publishing model was explored in detail, and other models were not, both due to time constraints and because it looked to be closer to the type of operation which authors favoured as part of our survey. Specifically: low APCs (Table 3, appendix 3), smaller and more focused bundle (consortia) of high quality journals, and publisher support. [Module M5]

8. The IMS model of publishing utilises separate companies Mattson (editorial support) and VTex (production services), manages to operate with flexibility, and keep their APC's low compared to the competition, (Table 3, appendix 3). A comparison of the financials (forecast 2025) for each of OUP and IMS can be found in Table 5 (appendix 3). There is no clear financial preference for either option without considering staffing costs borne directly by Biometrika. [Module M5]

9. The board did not choose to cease the OUP contract in 2024. As such, the next decision to leave can be taken no later than December 2025 which would result in a termination point of December 2026. Therefore, the earliest we could move publishers is January 2027. (To work with IMS/Mattson, we would need to be signing a contract during the summer in the year before, May/June 2026.) [Module M5]

10. We affirm that it is appropriate and desirable to invest surplus from publication back into the research community but we must keep in mind: prudence, what is best for the community, admin load on both office and board, and how funds can best support ongoing operations. [Module M6]

11. Librarians (at Cardiff, Sheffield, Lancaster, and Bristol independently) expressed concerns with the R&P model, scepticism about this model as a whole, and questioned whether it will survive long term. They do not believe this is a satisfactory route to open access for authors or institutions. Additionally, the librarians questioned the value of consortia "bundles" which may only contain a portion of the journals their institution is interested in and a non-trivial proportion of low impact journals. Librarians described Biometrika as a prestigious journal and core aspect of OUP's offering. The group was surprised that the narrative regarding R&P which OUP has been feeding to the Trust over recent years is not shared by librarians. [Module M5]

Group recommendations

1. Make clearer on our website (and OUP's) the types of articles which Biometrika would like to publish. [Module M1]

2. Increase visibility of the Biometrika editorial board. In particular, highlight subject specialism and geography. [Module M1]

3. Review the end-to-end author journey at Biometrika. Pay particular attention to the Biometrika style with a desire to streamline this formatting. [Module M1]

4. Biometrika should be looking to grow its author base and journal more generally. We should do this by making it clear what types of papers are welcomed. In particular, explore whether Biometrika should welcome articles which include algorithms and links to software as well as methodology. [Module M2]

5. Biometrika office to monitor (on an ongoing basis) our three comparator journals. [Module M2]

6. Editorial Assistant to monitor author interactions related to accessibility and restrictions on publication, and author satisfaction. [Module M3]

7. Office to monitor Read and Publish coverage at Top 250 Universities and analyse the coverage of this list with our (recent) author base by using ScholarOne. [Module M3]

8. Review/create guidance documentation for associate editors and referees working on Biometrika. [Module M4]

9. Review the editorial assistant tasks to allow for growth of the journals. This may require a change to editorial processes to cope. [Module M4]

10. Work with the OUP marketing team to devise a strategy to best reach readers and authors, and boost visibility. [Module M4]

11. Pause the question of "should Biometrika move to IMS and cease operations with OUP" until June 2025; the decision would have to be taken by December 2025 [Module M5]

12. The office to monitor (closely) the publishing environment. In particular the different routes to open access and the different options which are available to achieve this. [Module M5]

13. Office to keep track of the IMS operation (and USA attitudes to OA more generally) to assess how they adapt over time to the open access movement. [Module M5]

14. Cease the Biometrika fellowship programme and create a small grants scheme. [Module M6]

15. Further work (by the office) to look into whether an LMS Summer School type activity could be created for Statistics (aimed at undergraduates). [Module M6]

Appendix 1: Description of work assessing a possible switch from OUP to IMS/Mattson

Early in the group's work, the topic of APC's came up, which raised the question of why the Annals of Statistics APC is substantially lower than for the other three journals considered (Table 3, appendix 3). The Annals of Statistics is published by the IMS, so we contacted members of the operation involved in the management of their journal(s) to understand how their model works. Elyse Gustafson of the IMS directs this, and a company called Mattson Publishing Services (MPS) led by Geri and Krissi Mattson supports editorial activities. Initial contact with IMS and MPS had three elements:

1. A background of the journal, and our current setup with OUP.
2. A set of items we are currently exploring and why we are exploring them.
3. An initial list of questions on the topics of:
    a) Insight into the editorial process and tools used to manage articles.
    b) How the IMS model works in an OA world.
    c) Whether IMS and/or Mattson could help produce Biometrika, and what services and level of support would be provided to authors and other members of the Biometrika team by their operation.
    d) A cost and income breakdown.

MPS has been working with the IMS since 1994, and has had a contract for production services with VTex since 2001. MPS handles all of the IMS journals (Annals of Statistics, etc), the IMS supported journals (Bernoulli, etc). Additionally, MPS oversees six additional IMS Co-Sponsored journals (Electronic Communications in Probability, etc). All journals use the Editorial Journal Management System (EJMS) to manage the peer review process (similar to the way we use ScholarOne). These journals are published online at Project Euclid (and some also produce print versions).

The IMS/Mattson model is adaptable, and available to other publishers in various modes, but the relationship that seemed most suitable to Biometrika was to become an IMS supported journal, along with Bernoulli, Bayesian Analysis, the Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics, and Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré. This would involve a single contract with IMS, who would extend their existing contracts with Mattson and Vtex to provide editorial and production services respectively. IMS itself manages individual and institutional subscriptions.

IMS/Mattson provided financial projections for Biometrika if it moved from OUP to becoming an IMS supported journal. Subscriptions would include Biometrika as part of an IMS bundle, whose price to libraries would thereby increase by more than the cost of the OUP consortium bundle would consequently reduce. However, there is a question of whether it is better for libraries and for Biometrika for the journal to be part of a smaller focussed group of higher-quality journals or a larger and very diverse group. This may seem like an easy choice, however, factoring in that OUP has a much wider reach through their marketing and sales efforts makes the choice more complicated.

APC charges are not compulsory in the IMS model, but authors can opt for their work to be open access, even without an APC (if they cannot pay), if they wish. This was concerning to the group as this may become unsustainable as more people opt for OA. The group was also less than convinced at the preparedness of IMS/MPS for open access in the broader sense (such as R&P deals). The group looked into the financial models provided by MPS (Table 5, appendix 3). IMS takes a stake of 15% (net). As can be seen in this table, the financial models do not indicate a huge difference in the IMS and OUP models. However, there is a question of whether Biometrika staffing costs could be reduced under the IMS model, in which most management/editorial assistant duties are outsourced to MPS.

Appendix 2: Strategy group recommendations and motivations

#	Module	Recommendation	Core motivation(s)
1	M1	Make clearer on our website (and OUP's) the types of articles which Biometrika would like to publish. [Module M1]	Often, the content of a paper will help guide the author to the ideal journal (or the ideal readership).There are operational, ethical, and personal considerations which are included when authors select a journal. However, we should be a top candidate of consideration for all authors publishing in the area of statistical theory and methods. APT created this page recently to act as a growing database of collections they now distribute via CUP bi-montly. A number of different collections can be compiled. Such as: by topic, by geography, or by impact.
2	M1	Increase visibility of the Biometrika editorial board. In particular, highlight subject specialism and geography. [Module M1]	We must make it easy for authors to tie their work into the work which the journal welcomes. This can be done through past issues, and by name recognition of the editorial board. However, inclusion of topics may be helpful too. Perhaps this is a good time to look at gaps in the editorial board as well and assess areas in which Biometrika would like to welcome more papers. Survey quotes: "Perhaps increase the volume of Biometrika to embrace AI/Machine learning papers." and "Spend some money to recruit a more diverse editorial board." The APT editorial board page has high traffic and goes a long way in increasing the visibility of the APT. We also include a historical record of the editorial board. The APT does not have an open call for editors, but all members of the community who enquire are added to a list which is considered every year by the Editor in Chief, Deputy Editor in Chief, and Executive Editor.
3	M1	Review the end-to-end author journey at Biometrika. Pay particular attention to the Biometrika style with a desire to streamline this formatting. [Module M1]	Authors clearly find some of the requirements of the Biometrika house style onerous and excessive, and the LaTex style file difficult to use. This must not be a barrier to submitting articles to Biometrika for peer review. Furthermore, a review of an article's journey seems reasonable to ensure we provide appropriate feedback commensurate with the stage the article reaches. APT posts author information on their website, and not on the CUP website. More recently, mapping out the article 'journey' for authors to refer to ("Peer review and production process." Section here).

4	M2	Biometrika should be looking to grow its author base and journal more generally. We should do this by making it clear what types of papers are welcomed. In particular, explore whether Biometrika should welcome articles which include algorithms and links to software as well as methodology. [Module M2]	As more weight is placed on software implementation and methodology (as a pair), journals which sit in a space which contains a methodological foundation and accompanying software could become much more desirable in the industry. This could be an opportunity for a journal to fill this gap to welcome articles which include methodology as well as software. This could be a radical change (expansion) in direction for the journal. This line of thought works to support reproducibility in statistics by including data and software as part of the publication.
5	M2	Biometrika office to monitor (on an ongoing basis) our three comparator journals. [Module M2]	The aim here is to keep an eye on journal operations, important journal metrics, and initiatives taking place at these journals.
6	M3	Editorial Assistant to monitor author interactions related to accessibility and restrictions on publication, and author satisfaction. [Module M3]	The Editorial Assistant is the only person who has personal contact with the Biometrika authorship on a daily basis. As such, they are perfectly placed to assess the feel from authors as the open access movement progresses.
7	M3	Office to monitor Read and Publish coverage at Top 250 Universities and analyse the coverage of this list with our (recent) author base by using ScholarOne. [Module M3]	The logic here is in two parts: ● Biometrika has a lot of authors from top Universities, and indeed most articles have multiple authors. As such, we are interested in the proportion of accepted articles which have at least one author at a top University as this would mean the article is covered under a preexisting R&P deal. ● We keep a close eye on the development of OUP's R&P portfolio as it grows to cover our author base (and indeed readership). The aim here is to grow confidence that our authors will be covered by R&P deals as the current method for open access.
8	M4	Review/create guidance documentation for associate editors and referees working on Biometrika. [Module M4]	The motivation here is to get the editorial board on the same page with regards to standards and what Biometrika does and does not consider, and support everyone. ● There is a Lack of training/guidance/feedback to AE's (this is normal in the industry, but not good practice). We could put together a guide for what papers are welcomed in Biometrika. ● Some guidance for referees could be created. Potentially an optional template or checklist of items to think about in a referee report. (Though we must be careful as there is really no reason other than kindness why referees do this, but it is expected that AE's do engage.)

			• It may be that we need a manual to support AE's with ScholarOne as well. The focal point here is that we do not want page counts or article publishing rates to be restricting an article publication. Additionally, we do not want to be rejecting articles which have not historically been in scope but could be, as times change, interesting to the Biometrika readership.
9	M4	Review the editorial assistant tasks to allow for growth of the journals. This may require a change to editorial processes to cope. [Module M4]	It has been mentioned above that the style (both house style and style file) for Biometrika may be a drawback to the post-acceptance production aspect of the workflow. It is certainly the case that the style causes additional work for the office (Biometrika Editorial Assistant) and the OUP production team. Therefore an easy to use "Biometrika" style file could be devised with a short accompanying document. The "house style" (pageantry and particulars) should be clear and easy to understand as this is tied to the journal quality, and should not be relinquished lightly. The style file (LaTeX files themselves) should be easy to use for authors and the production staff. Addressing this aspect of the workflow should deliver on a better author experience, and free up time for the office to expand the journal and/or dedicate time to other areas of the operation, such as marketing.
10	M4	Work with the OUP marketing team to devise a strategy to best reach readers and authors, and boost visibility. [Module M4]	The OUP marketing team does know the industry and should be utilised to best market the journal and publicise some of the other recommendations/changes highlighted in this report (such as the board, and the types of articles which we welcome).
11	M5	Pause the question of "should Biometrika move to IMS and cease operations with OUP" until June 2025; the decision would have to be taken by December 2025 [Module M5]	Under the OUP contract the earliest we could now leave is December 2026, and the decision to do so would have to be taken by December 2025.
12	M5	The office to monitor (closely) the publishing environment. In particular the different routes to open access and the different options which are available to achieve this. [Module M5]	The movement towards R&P deals is publisher driven and widely disliked by libraries and authors; they are believed to be financially unsustainable, and unlikely to deliver true open access. There are various open science projects gaining traction which put authors first above publishers (such as EMS Subscribe to Open, Diamond Open Access, or other such like).

13	M5	Office to keep track of the IMS operation (and USA attitudes to OA more generally) to assess how they adapt over time to the open access movement. [Module M5]	Following conversations (both written and verbal) with the IMS/Mattson team, members of the strategy group were not convinced by their level of preparedness for open access in general; and IMS openly admitted they would not be able to handle R&P. However, if R&P is indeed the future of academic publishing (the group isn't entirely convinced), this would pose a rather large problem for the IMS's own journals, so this would need to be resolved.
14	M6	Cease the Biometrika fellowship programme and create a small grants scheme. [Module M6]	Fellowships are a large cost and benefit few people, whereas a small grant scheme has larger reach. Seeing fund distribution as 'marketing spend' will reinforce the brand and therefore strengthen the journal. Furthermore, the value available can be calibrated year on year (based on operational surplus) to ensure responsible spending. This scheme could include: regional meeting grants (speaker travel, accommodation, and catering), session sponsoring at a larger conference (Biometrika Session), conference travel (PhD student), and others the trustees feel would be supportive to the community.
15	M6	Further work (by the office) to look into whether an LMS Summer School type activity could be created for Statistics (aimed at undergraduates). [Module M6]	An undergraduate summer school could be a way to engage statisticians (very) early on in their careers who are not typically engaged with other funding routes. Other learned societies and/or corporate sponsors may be interested in joining in to reduce cost. The host institution does the majority of the organisation, with the funder handling small aspects of marketing and communications with attendee home institutions. The LMS Summer School 2023 cost the LMS £25,000 per year for a two week conference for 45-50 (UK based) (strong) undergraduate students. Mark ran a very successful LMS Summer School in 2023 and as such can support hosts.

Appendix 3: Summary tables

Category	Question	Very	Somewhat	Not at all
How important are each of the following in forming your view of a journal's reputation?	Impact Factor	26	53	17
	Other rankings (e.g. scimago journal ranking)	14	55	27
	The journals publishing partner(s)	14	36	46
	Views of other researchers	82	12	2
	Whether the journal has published ground-breaking papers in your area	87	9	0
	Who is on the editorial board	53	36	7
How important is each of the following in influencing whether you choose to submit your best work in statistical theory and methods to Biometrika?	Cost of open access	14	40	40
	Ease of use of LaTeX style	21	41	31
	Editorial board includes an expert in the area of your paper	59	31	6
	Journal reputation	93	3	0
	Journal web-site	9	51	34
	Time from submission to first response	55	38	3
	Time from acceptance to publication	35	51	10
	Quality of reviews of previous submissions	77	19	0

Table 1: Biometrika author/editor survey data.

Question	Comment
Would you wish to make any other comparative comments on the four journals listed above?	The Annals of Statistics doesn't necessarily come under "theory and methods". It seems to favour theory over methods.
	JASA and JRSS Series B are less theoretical/more methodological
	The four have a somewhat different focus which is very good. Depending on the relevant focus, the ranking could completely flip. I see these four as complementary. All four journals have equal status which is 'premium'.
	Biometrika has not kept pace with the current movement of AI/Machine learning, which may make the journal soon out of the mainstream journals in the era of data science.
	AoS is a bit out of touch, while Biometrika has a better balance between theory, methods, and practical use of statistics.
	Biometrika's style requirements are more cumbersome than the others, which creates a real barrier to submission. People are sometimes scared of its very constraining format (e.g. famous parentheses).
	I found the review process of Biometrika to be the worst. I found the screening process without any comments on the specifics very disturbing as the decision appears to be arbitrary or discriminatory.
The publishing industry is moving towards various open access models (author publication charges, read and publish deals, etc.) The Biometrika Trust is interested in author views on this transition. What are your feelings on this move to open access?	Open access is good, and it can also be free. Obviously the authors cannot pay with their own money. The Institute of Mathematical Statistics appears to have the best options here (i.e. just put the published paper on arxiv and/or website).
	Open access is good, having to pay for it or do lots of admin to get it is tedious. Transformative agreements save time.
	Journals must move towards OA. It is indefensible to paywall articles as it is harder for articles to make an impact.
	We should be taking control of this (away from the publishing companies, whose motivation is different). The main purpose of a good journal is quality control, which comes from the free labour of editors and reviewers. Print journals are an anachronism by now, and the costs of decent web presentation/distribution/archiving could be met more cheaply through arrangements between journals/societies. By such a route, the cost of OA could be reduced.
	The publication cost of open access is too high.
	Author charges discourage authors with few resources. Also harder to distinguish legitimate from predatory journals.
In addition to overseeing the governing of the Biometrika journal, the Biometrika Trust can provide funds to support the statistics community. How do you think this could best be done?	Funds focused on early-career researchers and PhD students in developing countries or disadvantaged researchers.
	Create some Biometrika awards (multiple ideas in feedback document) or small grant scheme
	Fellowships are a good idea, if they could be predictable and better advertised.
	Publication fee waivers for authors in need of these funds (for open access reasons).

Table 2: Quotes or paraphrases from the Biometrika author/editor survey. Full list of feedback can be found here.

	Journal 1yr IF over time						Journal 5yr IF over time		Cost to publish
Year	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2022**	**2023**	**Feb 2024**
Biometrika	1.64	1.63	2.45	3.03	2.70	TBD	3.2	TBD	£2,595 (link)
Annals of Statistics	2.97	2.78	3.76	4.58	4.22	TBD	5.4	TBD	£950 (link)
JASA Theory and Methods	2.83	3.93	3.85	3.67	3.44	TBD	6.2	TBD	£2,950 (link)
JRSS Series B	3.54	4.46	3.80	4.54	5.60	TBD	5.2	TBD	£2,495 (link)

Table 3: Impact factors over the last five years and five year impact factors in the last available window. Finally, costs of publishing open access (Author Publication Charges, APS's) are found in the far right column.

Journal	**2018**		**2019**		**2020**		**2021**		**2022**		**2023**		**2024**	
	Pages	**Article**	**Pages**	**Article**	**Pages**	**Article**	**Pages**	**Article**	**Pages**	**Article**	**Pages**	**Article**	**Pages**	**Articles**
Annals	3866	127	3608	121	3720	155	3649	151	3676	144	2299	97	TBD	TBD
Biometrika	1000	76	1004	74	1020	73	1003	71	1182	82	1124	69	TBD	TBD
JASA	1845	151	1938	172	2113	178	2100	177	2288	183	2945	240	TBD	TBD
Series B	1116	47	938	36	1398	50	1073	45	2089	51	1709	50	TBD	TBD

Table 4: Page counts and number of articles published over time in each of the four comparable journals.

Comparison with OUP	IMS		OUP	
	$	£	£	As at 2025
Costs	69,872	55,454	24,351	26,085
IMS/OUP Share	23,324	18,511	27,776	33,001
Outgoing	93,195	73,964	52,127	59,086
	$	£	£	As at 2025
Income	225,362	178,859	132,267	157,146
Net (Rate £1=$1.26)		104,894		98,061

Table 5: Shortened financial comparison of 2025 between IMS and OUP.

Financial	**Pros**	Income. Having adjusted for currency and differing base years (based on 2022 numbers, the latest we have from OUP), income from subscriptions and open access (OA): OUP, £166k; IMS, £179k.
		We would be able to move to a break even author pays OA model (not possible with current OUP contract).
	Cons	Expenditure. Having adjusted for currency and differing base years, OUP's costs (£27K based on 2022 numbers, the latest we have from OUP) are less than half IMS's (£55K) while OUP's share (£46K) is more than double IMS's (£19K). Overall: OUP, £73k; IMS, £74k.
		IMS income numbers must be seen as highly speculative. They assume their list of subscribers will pay for Biometrika, in effect, again (their OUP fees will hardly change).
		The IMS is a large organisation, as is VTex, however Mattson appears to be a small family run company organisation.
Publishing	**Biggest changes**	Change in editorial management system from ScholarOne to EJMS.
		Handling of the day-to-day journal operations may shift from Biometrika (Ros/Paul) to Mattson. Mattson/IMS did note that alternative arrangements to their standard offering exist, however may be less efficient if Biometrika were to join their operation.
		Articles move from hosting on the Oxford website to Project Euclid.
		Marketing of the journal would change from "small part of a large, varied consortia" to "larger part of smaller focussed bundle". It remains unclear which is better in practice, arguments are clear for both sides.
	Pros	We would be aligned more closely with a small, impactful set of IMS journals. This may be favourable in terms of 'public image'.
		There have been issues with production recently. Perhaps VTex might do a better job. Recent discussions within the salary review group indicate issues stem from complexity with the Biometrika style and its implementation. Both by authors and the OUP production team.
		Online article proof reviewing uses a successful web-based system at VTex so authors can edit source files directly. This is an update on our current (though functional) pdf markup based method.
	Cons	Initial setup time incurred when switching between systems. In terms of the physical move and with internal system knowledge. (Benefit to using ScholarOne is Mark uses it for APT and can backup if needed.)
		Moving from the OUP website to Project Euclid as the online portal for Biometrika may (a) make Biometrika harder to find, and (b) eliminate some of its visual identity.
		The US based IMS/Mattson group seems further behind and ill-prepared for the OA movement compared with OUP. It is unclear how their operation could be maintained in the OA future. Read & Publish deals (and APC's as a second option), which OUP are pursuing appear more viable.
		Workload is moved from Biometrika employees onto contractors. There is a risk in moving work from Biometrika employees to contractors, because of lack of oversight.

Table 6: A summary of the pros and cons in switching from OUP to IMS/Mattson.